

**Maritime Archaeology Working Group (MARCH)  
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary Office, Scituate, MA  
9:00 AM – 4:00 PM  
17 February 2004**

**Meeting Summary**

**Summary of Action Items**

1. SBNMS will revise the goal statement.
2. SBNMS will talk with the enforcement agencies (MA Environmental Police and the Coast Guard) about the circle vs. square.
3. SBNMS will redefine the criteria for Level 1 and Level 2 Sites.
4. A New activity will be created for the disclosure policy of hang sites.
5. The sanctuary will obtain a copy of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary's Draft Action Plan and use it as a model for the education and outreach strategy.
6. The sanctuary will create a constituent list.
7. The National Maritime Heritage Program management plan will be obtained and the SBNMS draft action plan will be checked to make sure it fits with the national goals and policies.

**Working Group Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Jerry Hill	SAC Member Chair
Ben Cowie-Haskell	SBNMS Team Lead
John Jensen	Mystic Seaport
Ivar Babb	National Undersea Research Center at UCONN
Dave Trubey (alternate for Victor Mastone)	MA Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources
Deborah Cramer	Conservation Community
Ned Allen (alternate for Martina Duncan)	Portland Harbor Museum
David Robinson	Public Archaeology Lab
Jeff Gray	Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Steve James	Recreational Diving Industry
Marcie Bilinski	Technical Diving Community
Bruce Terrell	National Marine Sanctuary Program

**Working Group Members Absent**

Anne Smrcina, SBNMS  
Bill Lee, Commercial Fishing (mobile gear) representative  
Don King, Gillnet (fixed gear) representative

**Others Present**

Deborah Marx, Rapporteur and SBNMS Maritime Archaeologist  
Matthew Lawrence, SBNMS Maritime Archaeologist

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES BY JERRY HILL**

Jerry Hill reported to the group about his report on the status of the Maritime Archaeology Working Group's progress to the Sanctuary Advisory Council. New members of the working group present for the first time were introduced (Ned Allen and Jeff Gray). January's meeting summary was reviewed and a motion was made to adopt the previous meeting's minutes; MARCH members seconded and adopted the minutes. The group walked through an overview of the meeting's agenda. Ned Allen and Ben Cowie-Haskell reported on the discovery of new material on the *Portland* from the Portland Steam Packet Company's agent John Liscomb. The material was in the possession of John Liscomb's family in Portland and contains letters, photographs, and newspaper clippings.

**ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION PART I: GOALS**

The sample goal statement for the Maritime Archaeology Action Plan, prepared by SBNMS, was reviewed and changed. Additional information on the significance of SBNMS's resources will be added and a statement on why SBNMS is focusing on maritime heritage resources (MHR) (in addition to the mandate in the National Marine Sanctuary Act) will be included in the text. The members felt that SBNMS is focusing on MHRs for the overall goal of resource preservation and protection. A question was posed to the group about why these sites need to be protected? Members responded that these cultural and historical nonrenewable resources are important, not only to the local area and the Gulf of Maine, but to the entire nation. Themes that need to be stressed in the goal statement included: these resources are nonrenewable so extra protection and limited access to the sites needs to be taken into account by SBNMS. Words like "riches" and "treasures" need to be avoided in the goal statement.

***ACTION: SBNMS will revise the goal statement.***

**ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION PART II: DRAFT STRATEGY III**

Concerns about a square vs. a circle protective area raised. Members felt that based on technology like GPS a circle should be used. This is also based on the circle that encompasses the *Monitor*. The Coast Guard expressed in the last meeting that they preferred a square for enforcement purposes.

***ACTION: SBNMS will talk with the enforcement agencies (MA Environmental Police and the Coast Guard) about the circle vs. square.***

Some members of the group felt that there needs to be less area than a 1 square nautical mile buffer protective area around the sites because it will help be a selling point to the acceptance of the action plan by fisherman. There is a fear that these 1 mile areas will grow from a few to a lot and close out a large area of fishing. Need to look to the users

of SBNMS to monitor and enforce these protective areas so make them smaller to gain the user's support from the beginning. The group still feels that on water enforcement by the Coast Guard and MA Environmental Police is still needed and the protective area needs to be big enough for enforcement reasons.

A concern was raised about how users will be informed and information updated about the location and specifics of the protective areas. Members thought that these protective areas should be buoyed to help fishermen, boaters, and other users know where the sites were. They felt that there were two options on how to mark these areas. One was to place a single buoy near the center of the protective zone. A second option was to place buoys around the perimeter of the zone, like in the Florida Keys. The buoys will serve as enforcement and educational markers. It was acknowledged that financially and logistically it was difficult to place and maintain buoys in deep sites, such as the *Portland*. Jeff Gray explained about the types of buoys used in the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and how they were installed and maintained. If the sanctuary was going to provide a notice to where shipwrecks for diving are located then they will need to install mooring buoys.

Another idea on how to mark the protective zones was raised by the members, which included combining the use of a buoy for more than one purpose. The SBNMS needed to look at the ocean observing system and partner with the system to offset the cost, monitoring, and maintenance of the buoys. Oceanographic marker buoys could have multiple benefits such as for monitoring, enforcement, education, outreach, and research.

If the sanctuary was going to go with the full disclosure of sites and then the placement of buoys at the site becomes a moot point some members felt. "Hang sites" will be disclosed but the National Historic Preservation Act allows the sanctuary to not disclose sensitive sites for site protection. Jerry Hill stated that the working group members should not base their decision on the sanctuary's current management strategy or position. He did not want the working group to be limited by the sanctuary during the creation of the action plan.

The sanctuary needs to weigh the impacts of fishing and diving and base their decision on the threat level. The nature of the threat is variable and the tools needed to mitigate the potential damage need to be used on a case-by-case basis. The group felt that all of the regulatory, enforcement and education mechanisms need to be in place before full disclosure is implemented.

For level three sites the sanctuary will assess the feasibility of buoying the site or the protective areas. One site buoy vs. perimeter buoys will be also addressed. The next five years will be seen as a test case. The group concluded that there needs to be the establishment of a protective perimeter and determine the effective way to mark the protective area with site protection always in mind on a case by case basis. The depth of the site will be taken into mind when choosing the size of the protective area. The protective area will not exceed 1 square nautical mile in area.

The group felt that the use of buoys and educational programs about level 1 sites would help in the protection of lesser level sites. Site stewardship by the users is crucial!!

For level 2 sites a question by some members was raised about why to restrict remote sensing operations when these actions are gathering data about the sanctuary. The sanctuary wanted to restrict the actions so that permits needed to be issued to insure that the data was passed on to the sanctuary. This will be reevaluated in the next draft of the action plan.

There was a question about how long sites will stay in the discovery level? Sites needed to be kept in the discovery level until the adequate mechanisms were in place to provide site protection and enforcement. This will aid the sanctuary in developing partners who will then hopefully help the sanctuary provide these mechanisms. In return more sites will be open for activities such as diving. All sites should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The sanctuary will use discretionary disclosure after the site is taken out of the discovery level.

The group decided to take away level 2 and combine the sites in to level 1 or 3.

This action plan is laying the groundwork for the SBNMS's MHR program. The life of the document is 5 years and the members recognize that this will be up for review and changes can and probably will be made at the time.

#### **PRESENTATION ON THUNDER BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY BY JEFF GRAY**

"Three Years Before the Mast" the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve: Jerry Gray began with an overview of the designation process of the sanctuary that lasted from 1981 until 2000. He stated that the entire sanctuary is within state waters and NOAA and the state of Michigan comanage the sanctuary. He talked about the maritime history of the Great Lakes and importance of Thunder Bay's geographic position as a haven for submerged resources. He then discussed briefly that the types of resources in the sanctuary range from prehistoric sites to modern day bulk carriers. He used site examples such as the *Pewabic* and *Cornelia Windiate* to show how the sanctuary is managing its resources through education and outreach programs.

SBNMS staff reworked the levels matrix and created a 2 level site management system during lunch.

#### **ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION PART II: DRAFT STRATEGY 3 CONTINUED**

A Member asked about performing a ceremony over the *Portland* site by passenger's relatives. He wanted to know if a vessel could stop over the site for this reason. The group raised the issue of stopping and enforcement. Members wanted to know the harm of stopping over the site. The prohibition of stopping was put in for enforcement reasons. From a management perspective it is important to include the language for the new level 2 sites.

***ACTION: SBNMS will redefine the criteria for Level 1 and Level 2 Sites.***

Clarification was needed for what exactly a “blue sky” approach meant and when it would be implemented. The group wanted the sanctuary to engage the public and provide more outreach prior to the disclosure of sites. Disclosure would not happen until the proper protection was in place.

The members felt that the sanctuary should inventory and prioritize the areas in the sanctuary based on use (for example highly fished areas). Disclosure of “hang sites” should be done first for highly used areas. However, disclosure of “hang sites” in highly fished areas would not happen until the final management plan was published and implementation had begun.

***ACTION: A New activity will be created for the disclosure policy of hang sites.***

### **ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION PART III: DRAFT STRATEGY 4 AND 5**

***ACTION: The sanctuary will obtain a copy of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary’s Draft Action Plan and use it as a model for the education and outreach strategy.***

Members felt that the sanctuary needed to increase its education and outreach program. The sanctuary also needs to identify its constituent groups and create material based on the specific group’s interests. Members expressed an interest in a naturalist certification course for whale watch boats to incorporate biological and cultural resource information.

***ACTION: The sanctuary will create a constituent list.***

For strategy 5, members wanted to understand what constitutes an environmental threat? What type of vessel and how many gallons of fuel? An environmental threat would be a tanker size vessel.

***ACTION: The National Maritime Heritage Program management plan will be obtained and the SBNMS draft action plan will be checked to make sure it fits with the national goals and policies.***

### **SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS**

*Gerry E. Studds* **Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary**  
Management Plan Review

**Maritime Archaeology Working Group – Agenda for Meeting 4**

**Date:** 17 February 2004  
**Location:** Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary  
175 Edward Foster Rd.  
Scituate, MA02066  
781-545-8026

TIME	TOPICS AND OBJECTIVES
9:00-9:15	<b>•Welcome</b>  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Jerry Hill
9:15-9:30	<b>•Review and Adoption of Minutes from Meeting 3</b> <b>•Review of Agenda for Meeting 4</b>  <u><b>Objective:</b></u> Working group members review what happened during meeting 3 and the agenda for meeting 4  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell
9:30-10:00	<b>• Round Table Discussion Part I: Goals</b> -Develop a overall goal for the action plan  <u><b>Objective:</b></u> Formulate a overall goal for the MARCH action plan  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell
10:00-10:45	<b>• Round Table Discussion Part II: Draft Strategy 3</b> - Review Updated Draft Strategy 3  <u><b>Objective:</b></u> Update Draft Strategy 3  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell
10:45-11:00	<b>• Break</b>
11:00-12:00	<b>• Round Table Discussion Part II Continued: Draft Strategy 3</b> Review Updated Draft Strategy 3  <u><b>Objective:</b></u> Update Draft Strategy 3  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell
12:00-1:00	<b>• Lunch</b> <b>• Presentation by Jeff Gray</b> - <b>Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary's Maritime Heritage Resources Management Strategy</b>
1:00-3:00	<b>• Round Table Discussion Part IV: Draft Strategy 4 and 5</b> Review Updated Draft Strategy 4 and 5  <u><b>Objective:</b></u> Update Draft Strategy 4 and 5  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell

3:00-4:00	<p>• <b>Round Table Discussion Part V: Strategy Descriptions</b></p> <p><b><u>Objective:</u></b> Develop strategy descriptions for strategies 1-5</p> <p><b>Discussion Leader:</b> Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
4:00-4:30	<p>• <b>Summary and Next Steps</b></p> <p><b>Discussion Leader:</b> Jerry Hill</p>